

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in conjunction with a request for continued examination. At the outset, the Examiner is thanked once again for the indication that claims 2-5, 8, 10-13, 16, 18-21 and 24 describe patentable subject matter.

5 Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 17, 22-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kepley et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,790,003, in view of Carleton et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,069,940. The Kepley et al patent has been described and distinguished in the Response submitted January 17, 2007; those remarks are incorporated herein. In general, Kepley et al describe the use of a data transport mechanism to deliver a voice message from one voice
10 message system to another voice message system. As indicated in Figure 4 there, an address header is appended to a digitally encoded voice message to enable that header/voice message to be delivered as a “data file” between these systems. Carleton et al is cited for its teaching of a system that enables a voice caller to leave a voice message, together with a subject line for that message. The subject line is then used to facilitate message retrieval by a recipient.

15 The Examiner’s characterization of the Carleton et al reference is correct. Thus, to address the pending rejection, each of independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 has been amended to further require that the “performing the action specified in the rule” function as recited in each claim now depends on “if the categorization data satisfy [] conditional criteria and no exception applies.” Each claim has also been amended to state that the rule includes “zero or more
20 exceptions.” Support for this subject matter is found, for example, on page 8, lines 6-7 (“each rule specifies an event and an action and may also specify ... exceptions to the rule”), and on page 19, lines 18-27 (describing how any exceptions in the rule are processed).

The prior art of record does not describe processing of an enterprise message that comprises a voice message and categorization data by:

25 “if the occurring event matches the triggering event for the selected rule, determining whether the categorization data for the enterprise message satisfy the conditional criteria specified by the selected rule; and

if the categorization data satisfy the conditional criteria and no exception applies, performing the action specified for the selected rule, the action specifying modifications to information in the data system identified by the categorization data.”

Thus, claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 are now deemed to describe patentable subject matter.

5 A Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



10

By:

David H. Judson, Reg. No. 30,467

15

15950 Dallas Parkway
Suite 225
Dallas, Texas 75248